

CP Violation in τ Decays at SuperB & Super-Belle Experiments – like Finding Signs of Dark Matter

I.I. Bigi^a

^a *Department of Physics, University of Notre Dame du Lac, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA*
email addresses: ibigi@nd.edu

Abstract

BaBar has found $A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S \pi^- [\geq \pi^0]) = (-0.36 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.11)\%$ with 2.8σ difference with SM prediction $A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S \pi^-) = (0.36 \pm 0.01)\%$ based on $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ oscillation. Four central points: (i) to establish both the ‘existence’ of New Dynamics (ND) and its ‘features’ in local CP asymmetries; (ii) to increase the number of final states to be probed; (iii) to emphasize correlations of CP violations between different final states; (iv) likewise for the correlations with $D^\pm$ final states. These measurements should be possible at SuperB & Belle II experiments.

Contents

1	Prologue: A New Era for ‘Our Universe’	1
2	Leptonic E[W]DMs	2
3	CP Asymmetries in τ Decays	2
3.1	General Comments	3
3.2	Landscape for τ Decays	4
4	Models for ND in τ Decays and Tools	4
4.1	Correlations of $\tau^\mp$ with $D^\mp$ Decays	5
4.2	Tools and Technologies	5
5	Summary	6

1 Prologue: A New Era for ‘Our Universe’

Since around the year 2000 we ‘know’ that our Universe consists of $\sim 73 \%$ of ‘Dark Energy’ (DE), $\sim 23 \%$ of ‘Dark Matter’ (DM) and $\sim 4 \%$ of ‘Known Matter’. The existence of DE and DM is *hypothesized* to account for data about the patterns of our Universe. We have candidates for DM, but hardly any one for DE.

The Standard Model (SM) has been very successful for describing known matter – *except* for

- neutrino oscillations with $\theta_{12}, \theta_{23}, \theta_{13} > 0$ [1];
- huge asymmetry between matter vs. anti-matter – i.e., our existence.

There is a good chance for leptonic dynamics producing ‘matter’ vs. ‘anti-matter’ asymmetry as a ‘shadow’ effect of the ‘lepton’ vs. ‘anti-lepton’ asymmetry. Therefore we need New Dynamics (ND) in the interactions between known matter states. I am too old to think about DE, but make useful comments about the existence, its features of ND and its correlations between flavour dynamics and DM. Before we said that DM is ‘somewhere overall’ in the Universe. Now we have found one ‘road’ of DM between two clusters of known matter [2].

After comments on E[W]DMs of electrons, μ and τ in Sect.2 I review CP asymmetries in τ decays in Sect.3, the landscapes & theoretical tools for finding ND in Sect.4 and summarize searching for ND Sect.5.

2 Leptonic E[W]DMs

Wonderful experimental research has lead to limits of $d_e < 1.1 \times 10^{-27}$ ecm from nuclear data. This is larger by several orders of ten than what SM can produce.

Muon EDM has been probed leading to $d_\mu = (-0.1 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-19}$ ecm from PDG. Using a ‘simple scaling’ from d_e one gets $d_\mu < 2.5 \times 10^{-25}$ ecm; however suggested ND models make $d_\mu < 10^{-22}$ ecm. If future data give evidence of $d_\mu \sim 10^{-20} - 10^{-21}$ ecm, theorists will probably come up with ND models that can generate those values [3].

PDG averaged data on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ give $\text{Re}[\text{Im}]d_\tau^w < 0.50[1.1] \times 10^{-17}$ ecm. My bet for finding ND in lepton forces underlaying matter-antimatter asymmetry: (i) Gold Medal: CP violation in neutrino oscillations; (ii) Silver Medal: EDMs; (iii) Bronze Medal: CP asymmetries in τ decays. Next week I might give the Gold Medal to EDMs and then change it again during next 5 - 10 years, before data can available. On the other hand for Austrian, German & Swiss people getting a Bronze Medal is a great success.

3 CP Asymmetries in τ Decays

Even if CP violation in charged leptons dynamics is not connected with matter-antimatter asymmetry, it is important to probe CP symmetry in τ decays with high accuracy: at the level of $\mathcal{O}(0.1\%)$ in $\tau \rightarrow \nu[K\pi/K2\pi]$ might have roughly the same sensitivity of ND in the amplitude as searching for $\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma)$ at the level of 10^{-8} [7]. For CP odd observables in a SM allowed decay are *linear* in a ND amplitude, while in SM forbidden ones the rates are *quadratic* in ND amplitudes: CP odd $\propto T_{\text{SM}}^* T_{\text{ND}}$ vs. LFV $\propto |T_{\text{ND}}|^2$.

BaBar Coll. have produced data with finding CP violation in τ decays is a ‘hope’ [4]:

$$A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S \pi^- [\geq \pi^0]) = (-0.36 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.11)\% . \quad (1)$$

CP violation established in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ oscillations gives as predicted [5, 6]:

$$A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S \pi^-) = 2\text{Re } \epsilon_K = (0.36 \pm 0.01)\% ; \quad (2)$$

i.e., there is a difference of 2.8 sigma between these two values. Thus there is experimental sign of global CP violation in τ decays. Furthermore SM gives

$$A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S [\pi^- \& K^-] [\geq \pi^0])_{\text{SM}} = 2\text{Re } \epsilon_K . \quad (3)$$

3.1 General Comments

Global asymmetries are often much more suppressed than local ones. One needs to probe different final states – include three- and four-body ones to establish its *existence* of ND. Furthermore it is crucial to determine its *features*. We should focus on transitions that are CKM suppressed in SM – like $\tau \rightarrow \nu[K\pi's]$ (or even better $\tau \rightarrow \nu[K\eta\pi's]$), when one has enough data in the future – where one has a good chance to identify both the impact and features of ND with less ‘background’ from SM amplitudes.

One needs conceptual lessons for probing CP violations in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[Kh_i]^- / \nu[Kh_i h_j]^-$ ($h = \pi, \eta / \nu[3K]^- / \nu[K3\pi]^-$ *separately* to understand the underlying dynamics. First one compares the τ^- and τ^+ widths of these final states (FS); however one should measure ‘local’ asymmetries as defined later.

Ignoring *weak* final state interactions (FSI) CPT invariance predicts

$$\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu X_{S=-1}) = \Gamma(\tau^+ \rightarrow \bar{\nu} X_{S=1}) \quad (4)$$

$$\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu X_{S=0}) = \Gamma(\tau^+ \rightarrow \bar{\nu} \bar{X}_{S=0}) \quad (5)$$

with $X_{S=-1} = \bar{K}^0 \pi^- / K^- \pi^0 [\eta] / \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \pi^0 [\eta] / K^- \pi^+ \pi^- / K^- \pi^0 \pi^0 / K^- K^+ K^- / K^- \bar{K}^0 K^0 / \bar{K}^0 (3\pi)^- / K^- (3\pi)^0$ and $X_{S=0} = \pi^- \pi^0 / \pi^- \eta / 4\pi / 3\pi / K \bar{K} / \pi K \bar{K} / 2\pi K \bar{K}$ etc.

Other symmetries and their violations connect same FS on different scales. In particular $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu \pi^- \pi^0 [\eta]$ can combine with $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu 4\pi / \nu 2\pi K \bar{K}$ to get close to CPT symmetry and for $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu 3\pi$ with $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu \pi K \bar{K}$.

Three items have to be dealt with:

- (1) One measures FS with K_S , K_L and their interferences. $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ oscillation impacts CP asymmetries as expressed by $2\text{Re } \epsilon_K$ in a *global* way for channels.
- (2) Mixing between $\bar{K}^0 \pi^- \Leftrightarrow K^- \pi^0$, $\bar{K}^0 \pi^0 \Leftrightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $K^- K^+ \Leftrightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ happen by FSI – like it does for $K\pi \leftrightarrow K\eta$, but on reduced level.
- (3) Theoretical tools exist for $\pi\pi$, πK , $K\bar{K}$ non-perturbative interactions based on dispersion relations and others that use data in different ways.

One can measure rates and CP asymmetries in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K\pi's]^-$ vs. $\tau^+ \rightarrow \bar{\nu}[K\pi's]^+$ and to calibrate ratios of $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[\pi's]^-$ vs. $\tau^+ \rightarrow \bar{\nu}[\pi's]^+$, where one expects that even ND can hardly produce measurable asymmetries.

For $\tau \rightarrow \nu[K2\pi] / \nu[3K] / \nu[K3\pi]$ one has more CP odd observables through *moments* and their *distributions* to check the impact of ND. Those are described by total four- & five-body FS – and therefore *hadronic* three- & four-body FS with *distributions* of hadrons. There are several theoretical technologies [7, 8, 9].

Unless one has *longitudinally polarized* τ , one needs differences in both the weak and strong phases to generate CP asymmetries in $\tau \rightarrow \nu[K\pi]$. Non-zero T odd observables can be produced by FSI without CP violation. On the other hand true CP asymmetries can be probed for τ^- vs. τ^+ decays.

Finding CP asymmetries in τ decays (beyond CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ oscillations) is a clear evidence for impact of ND. However one has to be prepared for very small effects and to depend on correlations with different FS.

There are important three points: (i) For expected data from SuperB and Belle II (and even for existing archives) one has to proceed step-by-step in experimental and theoretical work. (ii) One has to probe FS with η . (iii) One has to measure CP asymmetries in the pair of $\tau^-\tau^+$ to ‘tag’ them by $[e^+\nu\bar{\nu}]f_{\tau^-}$ and $[\mu^+\nu\bar{\nu}]f_{\tau^-}$.

SuperB experiment could produce a pair of longitudinally polarized τ and therefore probe T *odd* moments and their distributions in $\tau \rightarrow \nu h_1 h_2 / \nu h_1 h_2 h_3 / \nu h_1 h_2 h_3 h_4$ decays.

3.2 Landscape for τ Decays

The complex FS can be probed with classes of CP *odd* observables.

- (i) *0-dimensional* observables: $\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[\bar{K}h_i]^-)$, $\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[\bar{K}h_i h_j]^-)$ etc. or the *averaged* value of angles between planes of $\nu - K$ and $h_i - h_j$ etc. with $h_i = \pi, \eta$.
- (ii) *1-dimensional* ones: *lines* in τ rest frame like $\frac{d}{dE_\nu}\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[Kh_i]^-)$, $\frac{d}{dE_\nu}\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K2h_i h_j]^-)$ etc. or *angles* between planes of $\nu - K$ and $h_i - h_j$ in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[Kh_i h_j]^-$ etc.
- (iii) *2-dimensional* ones: *patterns* in ‘averaged Dalitz plots’ in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu X_{s\bar{u}}^-$.
- (iv) *3-dimensional* ones etc.

Three-, four- and five-body FS have two, three and four hadrons π , K and/or η . One can probe the complex FS with independent of τ production asymmetry [10, 11, 12, 13].

Belle/ BaBar and in the future SuperB/Belle II give the best landscape to probe $\tau^-\tau^+$ pair and thus to measure correlations. In Ref.[7] it was mentioned that

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^- \rightarrow [l^+\nu\bar{\nu}]_{\tau^+}\nu f_{\tau^-} \text{ vs. } [l^-\nu\bar{\nu}]_{\tau^-}\bar{\nu} f_{\tau^+}, \quad l = e, \mu \quad (6)$$

can be probed T *odd* observables $\vec{p}_{l^+} \cdot (\vec{p}_{h_1} \times \vec{p}_{h_2})$ vs. $\vec{p}_{l^-} \cdot (\vec{p}_{h_1} \times \vec{p}_{h_2})$ and their moments.

Transfer of longitudinally polarized e^+e^- to longitudinally ones τ will produce more observables in CP asymmetries depending on the angle between e^+e^- and $\tau^+\tau^-$ pairs.

4 Models for ND in τ Decays and Tools

There are several classes of ND models:

- The ‘natural’ ones are based on charged Higgs exchanges, in particular for $X_{S \neq 0}$ FS, since SM amplitudes are relatively suppressed compared to $S = 0$ ones.
- $W_L - W_R$ mixing affects $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu X_{S=-1}^-$ vs. $\tau^+ \rightarrow \bar{\nu} X_{S=1}^+$ decays. Limits one gets from B and K transitions depend on sizable inputs from theoretical uncertainties. CP asymmetries are produced by the phase between SM W_L and $W_L - W_R$ mixing amplitudes; therefore probing them offer higher sensitivity for ND.

- ‘New’ W_L bosons can couple with quark and leptons differently than SM W_L . One can compare the ratios of $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu X_h^- / \tau^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu}_l \nu_\tau$ vs. $\tau^+ \rightarrow \bar{\nu} \bar{X}_h^+ / \tau^+ \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu}_l \nu_\tau$.
- An exotic option is the class of leptoquark exchanges for $\tau^- \rightarrow [\bar{u}s]\nu$.

4.1 Correlations of $\tau^\mp$ with $D^\mp$ Decays

One should not stop after probing hadronic two-body FS. One needs to find the existence and the features of ND by measuring *many*-body FS with accuracy – namely for *hadronic three- and four-body* FS:

- (i) $D^- \rightarrow K_S \pi^- / K^- \pi^0 / K^- \eta$ vs. $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S \pi^- / \nu K^- \pi^0 / \nu K^- \eta$;
- (ii) $D^- \rightarrow K_S \pi^- \pi^0 / K_S \pi^- \pi^0 / K^- \pi^+ \pi^- / K^- \pi^0 \pi^0$ vs. $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S \pi^- \pi^0 / \nu K_S \pi^- \eta / \nu K^- \pi^+ \pi^- / \nu K^- \pi^0 \pi^0$;
- (iii) $D^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 / K_S \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+$ vs. $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K^- \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 / \nu K_S \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+$;
- (iv) $D^- \rightarrow K_S K^-$ vs. $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S K^-$;
- (v) $D^- \rightarrow K_S K^- \pi^0 / K_S K_S \pi^-$ vs. $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K^- K_S \pi^0 / \nu K_S K_S \pi^-$;
- (vi) $D^- \rightarrow K^- K_S \pi^+ \pi^- / K^+ K_S \pi^- \pi^-$ vs. $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K^- K_S \pi^+ \pi^- / \nu K^+ K_S \pi^- \pi^-$ etc.

The landscapes of multi-body FS for $D^\pm$ and $\tau^\pm$ decays are both different and similar:

- One has Cabibb favoured $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu d \bar{u} + q \bar{q}$ and singly suppressed $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu s \bar{u} + q \bar{q}$. The SM produces no CP asymmetries in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K^- [\pi' s]^0 / \nu K^- K_S K_S / K^- K^+ K^- / \nu K_S K_S [\pi' s]^-$ and in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu K_S [\pi' s]^- / \nu K^- K_S [\pi' s]^0$ global one due to $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ oscillations by $2\text{Re } \epsilon_K$.
- The landscape for $D^\mp$ decays is complex for several reasons.
 - DCS $D^- \rightarrow K^- X_{S=0}^0$ give no CP asymmetries in SM.
 - Again SCS $D^- \rightarrow K^- K_S X_{S=0}^0$ have input on global CP asymmetry from $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ oscillation by $2\text{Re } \epsilon_K$.
 - Furthermore SM produces direct CP violation in $D^- \rightarrow K^- K_S \pi^0 / K^+ K^- \pi^- / \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^- / \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0 / K^- K_S \pi^+ \pi^- / K^+ K^- \pi^- \pi^0 / \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^0$ (ignoring FS with η).
 - Both SM and ND affect the *topologies* of three- and four-body FS.
 - FS with K_S are affected by DCS and CF amplitudes. However the interferences in SM give a small corrections to $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ oscillations [7].

There is little reason why ND should affect D^- and τ^- decays in the same way.

4.2 Tools and Technologies

Heavy flavour states – namely H_b , H_c and τ – have many multi-body FS, and they offer more observables. One will not have infinite data; therefore we have to be practical and go step-by-step to probe CP asymmetries.

Usually one focuses on hadronic (quasi-)two-body FS in H_b and H_c transitions for experimental and theoretical reasons. For beauty transitions we know that the SM generates at least the leading source of CP violation; therefore we have to search for input from ND for nonleading source(s). For charm transitions SM might produce nonleading CP asymmetries; however ND should give us leading ones, but still only small ones. In both cases I want to know not only the ‘existence’, but also its ‘features’. Therefore one has to probe CP asymmetries with high accuracy. Three-(& four-)body FS needs more data and ‘working’ – but also gives us more lessons about the underlying dynamics. It makes also reason to use different ‘theoretical technologies’ for probing CP asymmetries ‘locally’ in the FS:

- (a) customary *fractional* asymmetry $\Delta(i) \equiv \frac{N(i) - \bar{N}(i)}{N(i) + \bar{N}(i)}$;
- (b) ‘Miranda Procedure’ [8] based on analyzing the *significance* $\Sigma(i) \equiv \frac{N(i) - \bar{N}(i)}{\sqrt{N(i) + \bar{N}(i)}}$, which are powerful for finding CP asymmetries and to localize them;
- (c) another one has been suggested in Ref.[9] based on unbinned multivariate results. More will probably come encouraged by future LHCb data and their interpretations.

5 Summary

SM cannot generate measurable CP asymmetries in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K^-\pi's]$ and a value of $(0.36 \pm 0.01)\%$ in widths for $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K_S\pi's]$. ND (like with charged Higgs exchanges) can affect these decays with hadronic two-, three- and four-body final states significantly with probing regions of interference between different resonances. To be more precise:

- One has to measure $A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K\pi]^-)$, $A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K2\pi]^-)$, $A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[3K]^-)$ and $A_{\text{CP}}(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K3\pi]^-)$.
- As emphasized before about B and D decays with three- and four-body final states, one gets contributions from resonances and their interferences for CP asymmetries. However ‘global’ asymmetries averaged over the total widths are significantly smaller than individual contributions.
- Therefore it is very important to probe the ‘topologies’ in the Dalitz plots.
- For $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K\pi]^-$ one can probe interference between vector and scalar states, which are somewhat suppressed. For $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K2\pi]^-/[3K]^-$ one can probe T odd moments due to vector and axial vectors exchanges and even more for $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[K3\pi]^-$, which should not be suppressed in general.
- On the first step to probe the final states as discussed above one can look for *local* asymmetries in $\tau^- \rightarrow \nu[3K + K2\pi]^-$ vs. $\tau^+ \rightarrow \bar{\nu}[3K + K2\pi]^+$.

SuperB and Belle II experiments should be able to probe the *whole* area of $\tau \rightarrow \nu[K\pi/K2\pi/3K/K3\pi]$ transitions with *neutral* pions in the final states.

One more comment about CP asymmetries in τ decays: These comments about the impact of ND is focused on semi-hadronic τ transitions. It is most likely to affect also B and D decays, but it could ‘hide’ more easily there due to larger effects (in particular for B transitions) and less control over non-perturbative QCD effects.

One has to probe the distributions of FS in τ (and B/D) decays to find the impacts and the features of ND(s) based on ‘binned’ [8] and ‘unbinned multivariate’ [9] results.

Final recent lesson from molecular biology about information in DNA : It was thought most DNA have ‘junk informations, no reason to probe it. Now experts say that at least 80 % of DNA are active and needed to understand informations.

Analogy: *Most features of ND are probed in multi-body FS in τ , H_b and H_c decays.*

Acknowledgments: I are very thankful for the organizers for this wonderful workshop at Nagoya. This work was supported by the NSF under the grants numbers PHY-0807959 and PHY-1215979.

References

- [1] F.P. An *et al.*, Daya Bay Collab., arXiv:1203.1669; J.K. Ahn *et al.*, RENO Collab., arXiv:1204.0626.
- [2] J.P. Dietrich *et al.*, *Nature*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature11224> (2012).
- [3] B.L. Roberts, Tau 2012 Proceedings; T. Mibe, Tau 2012 Proceedings.
- [4] BaBar Coll., arXiv:1109.1527; R. Sobie, Tau 2012 Proceedings.
- [5] I. I. Bigi, A.I. Sanda, *Phys.Lett.* **B625** (2005) 47; arXiv:hep-ph/0506037.
- [6] Y. Grossman, Y. Nir, JHEP 1204:002,2012; arXiv:1110.3790 [hep-ph] (2011).
- [7] I.I. Bigi, A.I. Sanda, "CP Violation, Second Edition", *Cambridge Monographs on Particle Physics, Nuclear Physics and Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press) 2009.
- [8] I. Bediaga *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **D80** (2009) 096006, arXiv:0905.4233; I. Bediaga *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **D86** (2012) 036005, arXiv:1205.3036.
- [9] M. Williams, *Phys.Rev.* **D84** (2011) 054015; arXiv:1105.5338.
- [10] A. Pich, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A21** (2006) 5652.
- [11] D. Delepine *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **D74** (2006) 056004; D. Delepine *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **D77** (2008) 016003, arXiv:hep-ph/0710.1441.
- [12] K. Kiers *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **D78** (2008) 113008; K. Kiers, Tau 2012 Proceedings.
- [13] CLEO Collab., S. Anderson *et al.*, *Phys.Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 3823.